



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,482	11/07/2000	Dimitri Kanevsky	YOR9-2000-0244-US1	9757

7590 07/08/2003
Daniel P Morris Esq
IBM
Thomas J Watson Research Center
P O Box 218
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, GRETA LEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/707,482

Applicant(s)

KANEVSKY ET AL.

Examiner

Grèta L. Robinson

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 May 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2177

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1, 2 and 4-8 are pending in the present application.
2. Claims 3 and 9-16 have been canceled.

Drawings

3. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on May 6, 2003. These drawings are not approved because the added textual label should have been applied to the original reference number element 120. Also, note attached form PTO 948 for Draftsperson's Review.
4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "120" appears to designate both computer and processor. (Note the proposed drawing amendment of figure 2 adding a textual label should have been applied to the original reference character number 120 in figure 2 or the original reference character should have been deleted so as not to cause confusion in element notation.) A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 2177

5. The drawings are objected to because a descriptive textual label is needed for element 120 in figures 2, and 3; note the label for element 120 in figure 1. A descriptive textual label is also needed for element 101 in figure 2, and elements 102 and 301 in figure 3. See 37 CFR 1.84(o). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “**desktop calendar**” [note claim 8 lines 1-2] must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2177

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully et al. US Patent 4,831,552 in view of Kovel et al. US Patent 5,274,363

Regarding claim 1, **Scully et al.** teaches a calendar system connected to a network [col. 5 lines 47-68] comprising:

- a first calendar and a second calendar [col. 8 lines 55-64];
- a video camera and a projector pointed at the first calendar;
- means for sending the data displayed on the first calendar to the second calendar or data displayed on the second calendar to the other first calendar wherein the system displays on the first calendar the data stored in the second calendar via the projector, and the system display on

Art Unit: 2177

the second calendar the data stored in the first calendar via said video camera; and[figure 5A; and abstract];

a computer for comparing the contents of the first calendar and the second calendar and for filling them with data missing from either, such that both the first calendar and second calendar are able concurrently to display altogether the same data [note abstract; figure 1 and figure 3A; col. 3 line 60 through col. 4 line 33; col. 23 lines 18-60].

Scully et al. teaches a method for concurrently displaying entries from a plurality of different electronic calendars based on interactively entered data. Scully et al. does not specifically teach a video camera and a projector pointed at the first calendar. However, Scully et al. does teach a method of concurrently displaying entries from a plurality of electronic calendars based on an interactive system coupled to a network via a communications link 24 inwhich various serially connected communication links may be attached transparently to the system [col. 5 lines 47-58]. **Koved et al.** teaches an interactive display system which allows first and second display systems to interact with a large projection or input device coupled to the computer [note figure 1 element 70; figure 2A element S4 "pointing at large screen"; col. 1 lines 1-10; col. 2 lines 35-47; col. 6 lines 15-18]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have combined Koved et al with Scully et al because Koved et al would provide an alternative method for the computer to print and/or display selected calendar entries from the plurality of calendars.

Art Unit: 2177

9. Claims 2 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully et al. US Patent 4,831,552 in view of Kovel et al. US Patent 5,274,363 and further in view of Jenson US Patent 5,570,109.

Scully et al and Kovel et al teach the invention substantially as applied to claim 1 above; regarding claims 2 and 4-7, "in which the computer for comparing the contents includes means for recognizing and interpreting the first calendar's content, wherein the system displays on the first calendar the first calendar the data that is stored in the second calendar, if such data is not displayed already on the first calendar" the references teach comparing the contents and means for recognizing and interpreting a calendar's content as cited above, (note citations in the previous paragraph). Scully et al. and Kovel et al. do not specifically teach wherein the system displays on the first calendar the first calendar the data that is stored in the second calendar, if such data is not displayed already on the first calendar. Jenson teaches this feature. **Jenson** teaches a mechanism for determining a display mode and allows data (i.e. calendar information) to be entered (i.e. add, delete, modify information) on a second system [note abstract; col. 13 lines 25-61; col. 16 lines 23-31]. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have combined the cited references because Jenson's ability to concurrently allow changes to be input col. 13 lines 55-61, would provide a means of synchronizing the plurality of concurrently displayed electronic calendars.

Art Unit: 2177

10. Regarding claim 8, "a third desktop calendar" [note: Jenson allows for the connection of I/O circuitry note I/O interface (18); col. 4 lines 9-36].

Response to Arguments

11. In the response Applicant argued the following:

(1) Regarding the drawings suitable corrections have been made for consistency in depicting the various features.

In response, to the drawing objection Applicant has not pointed out or depicted the "desktop calendar" in the drawings. Note drawing objection supra.

(2) Regarding the rejection under 35 USC 112 second paragraph all of the claims noted have been amended to overcome the rejection.

In response, Applicant's amendment overcomes the rejection cited under 35 USC 112 second paragraph.

(3) The examiner ignored the recital of the projector in the claim.

In response, claim 1 did not appear to include limitation referring to a projector and video camera, this is newly added limitation. However Scully et al provides for various serially connected communication links as a means of transparent operator interfacing. Also, note new citation Koved et al.

Art Unit: 2177

(4) The examiner has combined jenson with scully because Jenson's ability to concurrently allow change to be input would provide a means of synchronizing the plurality of concurrently displayed electronic calendars in Scully et al's system.

In response, this motivation is correct. Note new citation supra.

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2 and 4-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Williams US Patent 6,088,026

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2177

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greta Robinson whose telephone number is (703) 308-7565. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 pm. If any attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached at (703)305-9790.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop _____

Commissioner of Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(703)746-7239, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED

PROCEDURE")

or (703)746-5657, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Art Unit: 2177

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Greta Robinson

Primary Examiner

July 7, 2003